

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 3 and 5-21¹ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 2 and 4² are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 and 5-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barritz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,376) (hereinafter "Barritz"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every claim limitation must be found within the cited prior art reference and arranged as required by the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants respectfully assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein the data storage appliance contains an application suitable to copy the set of software from the first computer onto the data storage appliance" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites element 50 of Figure 2 of Barritz as disclosing a data storage appliance connectable to a first computer. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 2. The Examiner further cites column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 35 and column 6, line 5 – column 8, line 40 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Barritz instead discloses that when a user executes the program to install a software product from a distribution medium 50, via the Internet, etc., the tracker 36

¹ The Examiner states that claims 1, 3-5 and 7-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barritz. However, it appears that the Examiner actually rejected claims 1, 3 and 5-21 based on the claim limitations addressed in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

² The Examiner states that claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barritz in view of Kleinschnitz. However, it appears that the Examiner actually rejected claims 2 and 4 based on the claim limitations addressed in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

obtains all relevant information and writes that information in the directory 22. Column 9, lines 9-16. Barritz further discloses that migration process steps include identifying the software product and data files eligible for migration during the installation of the software product on the current computer, tracking data files created or operated on by the software product on the current computer, packing the software and data files to be moved and moving them to the second computer, and unpacking the moved files on the second computer. Column 5, lines 9-16. Barritz additionally discloses that packing the files can include compressing or encrypting the files and copying them to a movable storage medium, or can include transferring the files to the second computer via a data communications network such as the Internet. Column 5, lines 16-20. Furthermore, Barritz discloses that when a user decides that she wants to move from her current computer to a new computer, she invokes the loader 32, which is a facility of the operating system, and reads the directory 22 to determine which files are to be migrated to moving van 26. Column 10, line 15 – column 12, line 4. Alternatively, Barritz discloses that the specified files can also be directly copied to another computer or to a storage device accessible by both the current computer and the new computer, for example, an Internet File Transfer Protocol (FTP) repository. Column 12, lines 1-4. Hence, Barritz discloses installing software from a diskette 50 onto a computer. Barritz further disclose that a loader 32, which is a facility of the operating system, reads the directory 22 to determine which files are to be migrated to moving van 26.

There is no language in Barritz that discloses that diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance connected to a first computer) contains an application suitable to copy a set of software. Neither is there any language in Barritz that discloses that diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance connected to a first computer) contains an application suitable to copy a set of software from the first computer. Neither is there any language in Barritz that discloses that diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance connected to a first computer) contains an application suitable to copy a set of software from the first computer onto diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses the data storage appliance). Thus, Barritz

does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 1. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein the data storage appliance is connectable to the second computer" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner has not cited to any passage in Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. The Examiner had previously cited to diskette 50 of Barritz as disclosing a data storage appliance. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 2. There is no language in Barritz that discloses that diskette 50 is connected to both a first and a second computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 1. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein the application is also suitable to copy the set of software from the data storage appliance to the second computer" as recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites diskette 50 of Barritz as disclosing a data storage appliance. The Examiner further cites column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 35 and column 6, line 5 – column 8, line 40 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse. As stated above, Barritz instead discloses installing software from a diskette 50 onto a computer. Barritz further disclose that a loader 32, which is a facility of the operating system, reads the directory 22 to determine which files are to be migrated to moving van 26. There is no language in the cited passages that discloses that diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance) contains an application that is suitable to copy a set of software. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that discloses that diskette 50 contains an application that is suitable to copy a set of software from diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance). Neither is there any language in the cited passages that discloses that diskette 50 contains an application that is suitable to copy a set of software from diskette 50 to the second computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 1. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "verifying authorization to copy system files onto a destination computer" as recited in claim 9.

The Examiner cites column 7, lines 45-55 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the registry reader is a program that reads the registry to determine what software products are installed. Column 7, lines 45-48. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses verifying authorization to copy system files. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses verifying authorization to copy system files onto a destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 9, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "configuring the software for operation on the destination computer" as recited in claim 9. The Examiner cites column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 35 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), pages 5-6. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that it is an object of the present invention to provide a method and system for migrating software and data from an original computer to a second computer such that a user's operating environment as established on the original computer is preserved and available on the second computer. Column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 3. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses configuring software. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses configuring the software for operation on the destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 9, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 9. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "connecting to the destination computer an appliance containing computer-readable medium" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner had previously cited element 50 of Barritz as disclosing an appliance. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 2. The Examiner further cites element 26 of Barritz as well as Figures 7 and 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse. There is no language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A that discloses connecting the diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 of Barritz discloses an appliance) to a destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all

of the limitations of claim 15, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "executing a program stored on said medium without installation of such program on the destination computer" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner cites elements 26 and 50 of Barritz as well as Figures 7 and 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse. There is no language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A that discloses executing a program stored on the medium of diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses an appliance) without installation of such program. Neither is there any language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A that discloses executing a program stored on the medium of diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses an appliance) without installation of such program on the destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 15, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "copying the operating system software from a data set to the destination computer" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner cites Figures 7 and 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse. There is no language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses copying operating system software from a data set. Neither is there any language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses copying operating system software from a data set to a destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 15, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "copying a registry file to the destination computer" as recited in claim 15. The Examiner cites Figures 7 and 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse. There is no language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses copying a registry file. Neither is there any language in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of

Barritz that discloses copying a registry file to a destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 15, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 15. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Claims 3 and 5-8 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 1, and thus claims 3 and 5-8 are not anticipated by Barritz for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Barritz. Claims 10-14 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 9, and thus claims 10-14 are not anticipated by Barritz for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 9 is not anticipated by Barritz. Claims 16-21 each recite combinations of features of independent claim 15, and thus claims 16-21 are not anticipated by Barritz for at least the above-stated reasons that claim 15 is not anticipated by Barritz.

Claims 3, 5-8, 10-14 and 16-21 recite additional features, which, in combination with the features of the claims upon which they depend, are not anticipated by Barritz.

For example, Barritz does not disclose "wherein the application is further suitable to modify the set of software while it is on the data storage appliance and before such set of software is copied to the second computer" as recited in claim 3. The Examiner cites column 11, lines 1-12 and 59-65 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the packet 28 for a particular program performs whatever operations may be necessary to prepare the files needed to be migrated. Column 11, lines 4-6. Barritz further discloses that optionally, present to the user a list of all files on the current computer that have not already been packed, providing a facility by which the user can conveniently select all or some of the files to pack. Column 11, lines 59-62. Barritz additionally discloses that this can be done using standard interfaces, such as a presentation in the format of Windows Explorer™. Column 11, lines 62-64. There is no language in the cited passages that discloses diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance) contains an application suitable to modify a set of software. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that discloses diskette 50 contains an application suitable to modify a set of software while it is on diskette 50

(Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance). Neither is there any language in the cited passages that discloses that diskette 50 contains an application that is suitable to modify a set of software while it is on diskette 50 and before such set of software is copied to a second computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 3, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 3. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein such modification comprises an addition to the set of software" as recited in claim 5. The Examiner cites column 11, lines 1-12 and 59-65 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 4. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the packet 28 for a particular program performs whatever operations may be necessary to prepare the files needed to be migrated. Column 11, lines 4-6. Barritz further discloses that optionally, present to the user a list of all files on the current computer that have not already been packed, providing a facility by which the user can conveniently select all or some of the files to pack. Column 11, lines 59-62. Barritz additionally discloses that this can be done using standard interfaces, such as a presentation in the format of Windows Explorer™. Column 11, lines 62-64. There is no language in the cited passages that discloses a modification that includes an addition to the set of software. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 5, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 5. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein such addition comprises a set of drivers particular to the operation of the set of software in the environment of the second computer" as recited in claim 6. The Examiner cites column 1, lines 23-40 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that as used herein, references to a 'current' computer means the first or original computer and references to 'another' or 'new' computer means a second computer to which a user wishes to migrate. Column 1, lines 23-27. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses that the addition to the set of software comprises a set of drivers. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses that the addition to the set of software comprises a set of drivers particular

to the operation of the set of software. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses that the addition to the set of software comprises a set of drivers particular to the operation of the set of software in the environment of the second computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 6. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein such modification comprises modifying the order of the members of the set of software" as recited in claim 7. The Examiner cites column 12, lines 23-37 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that unloader 34 performs the operation of reading the control information from the moving van 26 to determine how the unpacking operation is to be performed. Column 12, lines 23-25. There is no language in the cited passages that discloses a modification that includes modifying an order of the members of the set of software. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 7, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 7. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein the application is further suitable to disable the set of software on the first computer" as recited in claim 8. The Examiner cites column 10, lines 45-60 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 5. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that optionally, the loader or packer recognizes the licensing specifications pertaining to each software product and, if required, disables the software product on the original computer. Column 10, lines 47-50. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses that diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance) contains an application that is suitable to disable a set of software. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses that diskette 50 (Examiner asserts that diskette 50 discloses a data storage appliance) contains an application that is suitable to disable a set of software on a first computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 8, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 8. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "having stored thereon computer-executable instructions, wherein the computer-executable instructions are configured so as to execute automatically upon the medium's insertion into the destination computer" as recited in claim 13. The Examiner cites Figures 7 and 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse. There is no language in the description of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions are configured so as to execute automatically. Neither is there any language in the description of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions are configured so as to execute automatically upon the medium's insertion. Neither is there any language in the description of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions are configured so as to execute automatically upon the medium's insertion into the destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 13, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 13. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing the steps further comprising: installing an operating system onto the computer from the medium; and rebooting the computer" as recited in claim 14. The Examiner cites Figures 7 and 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 7. Applicants respectfully traverse. There is no language in the description of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions performs the step of installing an operating system. Neither is there any language in the description of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions performs the step of installing an operating system onto the computer. Neither is there any language in the description of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions performs the step of installing an operating system onto the computer from the medium. Neither is there any language in the description

of Figure 7 and 7A that discloses computer-executable instructions stored thereon where the computer-executable instructions performs the step of rebooting the computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 14, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 14. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "copying a supplemental registry file to the destination computer" as recited in claim 16. The Examiner cites column 11, lines 1-12 and 59-65 as well as Figure 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 8. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the packer 28 for a particular program performs whatever operations may be necessary to prepare the files needed to be migrated. Column 11, lines 4-6. Barritz further discloses that optionally, present to the user a list of all files on the current computer that have not already been packed, providing a facility by which the user can conveniently select all or some of the files to pack. Column 11, lines 59-62. There is no language in the cited passage or in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses copying a supplemental registry file. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses copying a supplemental registry file to a destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 16, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 16. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "adding the supplemental registry file to the registry file, wherein the supplemental registry file contains configuration information relating to an application installed on the destination computer" as recited in claim 16. The Examiner cites column 11, lines 1-12 and 59-65 as well as Figure 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 8. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the packer 28 for a particular program performs whatever operations may be necessary to prepare the files needed to be migrated. Column 11, lines 4-6. Barritz further discloses that optionally, present to the user a list of all files on the current computer that have not already been packed, providing a facility by which the user can conveniently select all or some of the files to pack. Column 11, lines 59-62. There is no language in the

cited passage or in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses adding a supplemental registry file to a registry file. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses adding a supplemental registry file to a registry file, where the supplemental registry file contains configuration information. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figures 7 and 7A of Barritz that discloses adding a supplemental registry file to a registry file, where the supplemental registry file contains configuration information relating to an application installed on the destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 16, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 16. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "copying a supplemental registry instruction file to the destination computer; and executing the instructions in the supplemental registry instruction file to remove entries from the registry file, wherein the supplemental registry instruction file contains instructions to remove configuration information relating to an application not installed on the destination computer" as recited in claim 17. The Examiner cites column 10, lines 45-60 as well as Figure 7A and associated text of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitations. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 8. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that optionally, the loader or packer recognizes the licensing specifications pertaining to each software product and, if required, disables the software product on the original computer. Column 10, lines 47-50. Barritz further discloses invoking the packer 28 for that product, specifying if necessary the location and identify of the moving van 26, as well as the location and identity of any associated control file. Column 10, lines 61-64. There is no language in the cited passage or in the description of Figure 7A that discloses copying a supplemental registry instruction file. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figure 7A that discloses copying a supplemental registry instruction file to a destination computer. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figure 7A that discloses executing the instructions in the supplemental registry instruction file. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figure 7A that discloses executing the instructions in the supplemental registry instruction file to remove

entries from the registry file. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figure 7A that discloses executing the instructions in the supplemental registry instruction file to remove entries from the registry file, where the supplemental registry instruction file contains instructions to remove configuration information. Neither is there any language in the cited passage or in the description of Figure 7A that discloses executing the instructions in the supplemental registry instruction file to remove entries from the registry file, where the supplemental registry instruction file contains instructions to remove configuration information relating to an application not installed on the destination computer. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 17, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 17. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "executing the installation program for the application, wherein the installation program updates the registry file with entries appropriate to the application" as recited in claim 19. The Examiner cites column 7, lines 45-55; column 9, lines 35-65; and column 11, lines 1-15 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 9. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the registry reader is a program that reads the registry to determine what software products are installed. Column 7, lines 46-49. Barritz additionally discloses that if the tracker is not implemented as a facility of the operating system, a resident program, a modification or add-on to the operating system, or other ways involving interaction with installers and uninstallers, the determination of what software products are installed and their packers and unpackers can be made after-the-fact, at any time, in several ways. Column 9, lines 38-44. Barritz further discloses that the packer 28 for a particular program performs whatever operations may be necessary to prepare the files needed to be migrated. Column 11, lines 4-6. There is no language in the cited passages that discloses executing an installation program for the application, where the installation program updates the registry file. Neither is there any language in the cited passages that discloses executing an installation program for the application, where the installation program updates the registry file with entries appropriate to the application. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 19, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 19. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein the data set is accessed via a network" as recited in claim 20. The Examiner cites column 4, line 65 – column 5, line 35; and column 6, line 5 – column 8, line 40 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 9. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the migration process steps include identifying the software product and data files eligible for migration during the installation of the software product on the current computer, tracking data files created or operated on by the software product on the current computer, packing the software and data files to be moved and moving them to the second computer, and unpacking the moved files on the second computer. Column 5, lines 9-16. There is no language in the cited passages that discloses copying the operating system software from a data set, where the data set is accessed via a network. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 20, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 20. M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants further assert that Barritz does not disclose "wherein the data set contains a storage address file which specifies the files comprising the operating system software" as recited in claim 21. The Examiner cites column 6, line 5 – column 8, line 40 of Barritz as disclosing the above-cited claim limitation. Office Action (9/8/2006), page 9. Applicants respectfully traverse and assert that Barritz instead discloses that the moving van is a collection of data pertaining to the software products to be moved in a format suitable for use by the unloader. Column 8, lines 9-12. There is no language in the cited passage that discloses copying the operating system software from a data set, where the data set contains a storage address file. Neither is there any language in the cited passage that discloses copying the operating system software from a data set, where the data set contains a storage address file which specifies the files comprising the operating system software. Thus, Barritz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 21, and thus Barritz does not anticipate claim 21. M.P.E.P. §2131.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that not each and every claim limitation was found within Barritz, and thus claims 1, 3 and 5-21 are not anticipated by Barritz. M.P.E.P. §2131.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barritz in view of Kleinschnitz, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0191911) (hereinafter "Kleinschnitz"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons stated below, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and hence claim 2 is patentable over Barritz in view of Kleinschnitz for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Barritz as discussed above in Section I. Claim 4 depends from dependent claim 3 which depends from independent claim 1, and hence claim 4 is patentable over Barritz in view of Kleinschnitz for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 3 are patentable over Barritz as discussed above in Section I.

III. CONCLUSION:

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that claims 1-21 in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an allowance of such claims. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,159

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, TX 75201
(512) 370-2832

Austin_1 328873v.1